

The Graduate Education of Warrant Officers by AMSP Provides Benefits to the Army

**A Monograph
by
CW5 Manuel D. Vasquez
United States Army**



**School of Advanced Military Studies
United States Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas**

AY 2012-02

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 22-05-2012		2. REPORT TYPE SAMS Monograph		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) JAN 2012 DEC 2012	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Graduate Education of Warrant Officers by AMSP Provides Benefits to the Army				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) CW5 Manuel Vasquez				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) School for Advanced Military Studies 320 Gibson Avenue Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301				8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached abstract					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Identity Conflict, Genocide					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: Unclassified / Releaseable			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT (U)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 44	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)	c. THIS PAGE (U)			19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code)

SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES

MONOGRAPH APPROVAL

Chief Warrant Officer Manuel D. Vasquez

Title of Monograph: The Graduate Education of Warrant Officers by AMSP
Provides Benefits to the Army

Approved by:

_____	Monograph Director
Jeffrey J. Kubiak, Ph.D.	

_____	Second Reader
Christopher C. LaNeve, COL, IN	

_____	Director, School of Advanced Military Studies
Thomas C. Graves, COL, IN	

_____	Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.	

Disclaimer: Opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed or implied within are solely those of the author, and do not represent the views of the US Army School of Advanced Military Studies, the US Army Command and General Staff College, the United States Army, the Department of Defense, or any other US government agency. Cleared for public release: distribution unlimited.

Abstract

THE GRADUATE EDUCATION OF WARRANT OFFICERS BY AMSP PROVIDES
BENEFITS TO THE ARMY by CW5 Manuel D. Vasquez, United States Army, 40 pages

Warrant Officers are the Army's technical experts, and provide commanders with detailed information in their area of expertise. The traditional Warrant Officer path is very narrow and focused, however the Army has recently begun offering broadening opportunities to Warrants such as the Advanced Military Studies Program (AMSP). In 2010, the first group of warrant officers graduated AMSP and moved on to assignments throughout the operational Army. The program transforms select officers into agile and adaptive leaders able to think creatively and critically and develop viable options for commanders. This monograph examines the benefits that AMSP educated warrant officers provide to the Army and answers the question, "Why does the Army send Warrant officers to AMSP?"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: Introduction	1
Section 2: History of the United States Army Warrant Officer.....	3
The Origins of Warrant Officers from Napoleon to the Royal Navy	3
The Beginning of Warrants Officers in the American Army.....	8
The Mine Planter Service.....	9
A New Era for Army Warrant Officers Begins	10
The Modern Era for the Army Warrant Officer Corps	12
Section 3: Advanced Military Studies Program (AMSP).....	15
Creating Adaptive Leaders	16
The Origins of the AMSP	19
Analyzing the AMSP Prerequisites	21
Civilian Education	21
Military Education	23
Key Developmental Positions Post AMSP	26
Summary	27
Section 4: Arguments against Warrant Officers at AMSP	28
What Does the Army Want from its Warrant Officers?	28
Warrant officers do not need a graduate education.....	30
Filling O-grade staff positions with Warrant Officers	32
Warrants Do Not Seem to Fit the AMSP Utilization Tour Model.....	34
Keeping Warrant Officers Relevant Post-AMSP.....	35
“You ain’t the boss of me!” Warrant officers leading OPTs	35
Summary	36
Section 5: Conclusion.....	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	40

Section 1: Introduction

Warrant Officers are the Army's technical experts, and provide commanders with detailed information in their area of their expertise. Over the years, the Warrant Officer cohort has taken greater responsibilities that are non-traditional, but link back to their area of technical expertise. These technical areas are as diverse as food service to targeting, to aviation. Warrant Officers earn their commission by virtue of hard-earned skill in their military occupational specialty, and demonstrated expertise over many years of service as non-commissioned officers.¹ The traditional Warrant Officer path is very narrow and focused, however the Army has recently begun offering broadening opportunities to Warrants such as the Advanced Military Studies Program (AMSP).

AMSP is a graduate program for the most intellectually astute majors that have completed Intermediate Level Education (ILE). The program transforms select majors into agile and adaptive leaders able to think creatively and critically and develop viable options for commanders. In 2010, the first group of warrant officers graduated AMSP and moved on to assignments throughout the operational Army, and a fourth warrant will graduate in December 2012. This monograph examines the benefits that AMSP educated warrant officers provide to the Army and answers the question, "Why does the Army send Warrant officers to AMSP?"

Understanding the history and development of the modern Warrant Officer Corps is critical to understanding why the Army sends warrant officers to the AMSP. Section two of this monograph examines the history of the warrant officer cohort beginning with the Napoleonic Era. The Royal Navy employed first employed warrant officers with great success to overcome many of their technological shortcomings. Before World War I the American Army was struggling with

¹U.S. Department of the Army, AR 601-210, *Active and Reserve Components Enlistment Program* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2011). Army Aviation Warrant Officers are the only warrants eligible to appoint without the benefit of prior service.

rapid advances in technology and began to employ warrant officers to provide the technical expertise needed to integrate the tremendous influx of personnel required for the War. Following World War I through the end of the World War II the Warrant Officer Corps suffered through a period of instability with the rapid changes affecting the Army. Finally, during the Cold War period the warrant officer cohort went through many modifications to keep it relevant to the Army's mission. According to Army Regulation 611-1, "The warrant officer is the highly specialized expert and trainer, who, by gaining progressive levels of expertise and leadership, operates, maintains, administers, and manages the Army's equipment, support activities, or technical systems for an entire career."² This definition seems to describe a career path with requirements at odds with a program like the AMSP that emphasizes abstract concepts like critical and creative thinking.

In order to link the needs of the Army, the career requirements of warrant officers, and the benefits of having AMSP educated warrant officers, section three examines the purpose of the School of Advanced Military Studies, and the rationale for the AMSP. General (GEN) Martin Dempsey and Major General (MG) Robert Scales have delivered speeches and essays that outline the Army's need for adaptive and agile leaders. Both argue that the military must experience a learning revolution because the modern enemies of America are learning entities looking for ways to overcome our American firepower advantage. General Dempsey argues that today's warrant officer must be educated at the same level as O-grade officers because since the Cold War the future has ever-increasing technical requirements. Section three concludes with an examination of the education process for both O-grade and warrant officers to show the compatibility of groups.

²U. S. Department of the Army, AR 611-11, *Selection and Training of Army Aviation Officers* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1997), 15.

Section four of this monograph will discuss some of the counter arguments opposing warrant officers attending AMSP. Despite evidence that proves that AMSP educated warrant officers provide a benefit to the Army there are some that disagree with them attending the course. The arguments against warrant officers attending AMSP contain some plausible points. The points encompass areas of concern with O-grade officer career progression, the uniqueness of warrant officers, warrant officers meeting the requirements for attending AMSP, and many others. The result is that this section will show that some of these arguments are without merit and those arguments that raise valid concerns are outweighed by the benefit to the Army of having warrant officers in AMSP.

Section 2: History of the United States Army Warrant Officer

In 2009, the Army decided to allow warrant officers to attend the Advanced Military Studies Program (AMSP) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Three warrant officers graduated in 2010, and a fourth will graduate in 2012. The AMSP prepares officers to lead teams in support of military operations and be effective planners who can apply operational art and science. The course improves officer's ability to use critical and creative thinking skills to develop solutions to problems in Army operations. AMSP educated officers are in great demand within the operational Army. Throughout history, warrant officers bring a unique quality and technical expertise to the American Army. By combining technical expertise of the warrant officer, with the critical and creative thinking of the AMSP graduate, the Army creates a powerful resource.

The Origins of Warrant Officers from Napoleon to the Royal Navy

The rank of warrant officer has been in existence since the time of Napoleon Bonaparte. Napoleon needed men he trusted, and appointed warrant officers to relay messages from the

commissioned officers to the enlisted soldiers. These Napoleonic era soldiers are the first to have their rank linked to the possession of a technical expertise.³

In the early years of the British Navy, men of privileged backgrounds received royal commissions to command ships. These officers were only concerned with the tactics needed to defeat an enemy naval force. These same naval officers had no understanding of how to keep a warship at a high state of readiness. The Royal Navy recruited a group of specialists with the necessary technical backgrounds to fill that role. These technical experts stayed with the same ship for the duration of its commission. These technicians received a Warrant signed by members of a naval board. Unlike the ordinary officers who received their commission from a Board of Admiralty.⁴ The intent behind the Warrant was to distinguish these technician sailors from the other common sailors, but still maintain a certain level of separation between the warrant officers and the regular line officers according to strict Royal Navy protocol.⁵

The Royal Navy developed four levels of warrant officers, comparable to the concept envisioned by the United States military for warrant officers in the 1940s. The top tier warrant officers on a ship were the wardroom officers.⁶ The master was the most senior warrant officer; chaplain, surgeon, and the pursers were also wardroom officers. These wardroom warrant officers had the authority to walk the quarterdeck, reside in the wardroom, and had the most in common

³United States Army Warrant Officer Career College, *Army WO History*, <http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/wocc/woprogram.asp#history>, (accessed 1 May 2012).

⁴Brian Lavery, *Nelson's Navy: The Ships, Men, and Organization, 1783-1815* (London: Conway Maritime Press, 1989), 100.

⁵Warrant Officers Heritage Foundation and other contributors, "Army Warrant Officer History," *The Legacy of Leadership as a Warrant Officer*, http://www.usawoa.org/woheritage/hist_of_army_wo.htm, (accessed 1 May 2012).

⁶Deborah W. Cutler, and Thomas J. Cutler, *Dictionary of Naval Terms*, (Naval Institute Press, 2005). Defines the wardroom as the living quarters for all commissioned officers except for the commanding officer.

with the commissioned naval officers.⁷ The master was responsible for many key functions on the vessel from the navigation, to supervising the maintenance, to supervising the midshipmen. He ranked below the lieutenants, and when captured was not treated as an officer. Since the master controlled many of the activities on a ship, some thought they were equal to the commissioned officers. This tension caused problems within the wardroom.⁸

The surgeon was the medical officer of a Royal ship and learned his trade during an on-shore apprenticeship. The navy did not require the surgeon to have a medical degree, primarily because formal medical training was lacking in that era. The applicant with negligible training had to pass an oral board at the Surgeon's Hall in London before receiving a Warrant from the Naval Board. An alternative route for the surgeon applicant was to pass an examination given by the surgeon of the fleet, the physician and surgeon of the hospital, and three surgeons of the squadron. After successfully passing the examination, the candidate attained the rank of Surgeon's Mate. Eventually the system promoted the Surgeon's Mate to the rank of Surgeon and in the end they become part of the commissioned officer ranks.⁹ The chaplain was responsible for the religious wellbeing of the crew.¹⁰ The chaplain initially was not part of the wardroom. Eventually, the chaplain received the authority to mess with the lieutenants and to quarter in the wardroom or gunroom.¹¹

The purser was the ship's supply officer and was required to serve a year as a captain's clerk or eighteen months in the office of the secretary of a flag officer before qualifying for the

⁷Ibid. Defines the quarterdeck as the ceremonial area of a ship kept clean, neat, and was the domain of the officer of the deck.

⁸Lavery, 101.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Lavery, *Nelson's Navy: The Ships, Men, and Organization, 1783-1815* defines the gunroom as an officer's living area on all rated ships. The gunroom was located aft on the lower deck with no stern windows and was only ventilated and lighted by gratings in the deck or through the gun ports.

position. He was responsible for all life support on board a vessel to include food, clothing, heat, light, and bedding. However, he did not handle government funds or the ship's payroll. The purser's pay was less than half of the other warrants and he made up the difference by being frugal with the provisions. It was customary for him to place a bond for the security of those supplies. Crews often accused the pursers with stealing their rations. Applicants for purser positions never diminished even though many became bankrupt.¹²

The next level of warrant officer in the Royal Navy was the gunroom officer. Their primary function was to reach the wardroom in time to defend it. Lower grade masters and surgeons were part of this group especially on some of the much smaller ships. At the time, there was no structured method for a sailor to become a master. Some were promoted directly from the lower levels and others qualified by an examination given by a senior captain and three of the best-qualified masters.¹³

The third group of Royal Navy warrant officers were called standing officers. The standing officers stayed with the ship during the entire dry dock period and were responsible for its maintenance. The boatswain, carpenter, and the gunner were all standing officers and they were the closest equivalent to modern day warrant officers. In accordance with naval regulation, both the boatswain and gunner had to have at least served a year as a petty officer before becoming warrant officers.¹⁴ This requirement for some noncommissioned officer experience is common with many of the technical services warrant officers in today's United States Army.¹⁵

The boatswains were seamen who had risen through the ranks and were responsible for all the rigging and sails of the ship. He was also responsible for crew morale, and to ensure the

¹²Ibid., 100-101.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵U. S. Department of the Army, Warrant Officers, <http://www.goarmy.com/about/service-options/enlisted-soldiers-and-officers/warrant-officers.html> (accessed 1 May 2012).

crew performed all the deck duties in a proficient manner. The carpenters were the only standing room officers that did not learn their profession from embarkations. Before becoming carpenters, they were required to have served an apprenticeship under a shipwright, six months as a carpenter's mate from one or more Royal ships, and in possession of the proper certificates.¹⁶

The gunners learned their cannon maintenance skills from minimal opportunities to shoot the naval cannons while afloat. Gunners pursued certification in accordance with naval regulation to perform their tasks. Yet the regulation never mentioned who was responsible for administering the qualifying tests to the gunner. Additionally the gunner had to have served at least a year as a petty officer before becoming a warrant officer. The primary function of the gunner was to service the guns and associated equipment, not the actual firing of those weapons.¹⁷

The final groups were the lower grade warrant officers. These warrant officers were the cooks, master at arms, or the sail makers on board a ship. They were comparable to petty officers by the Admiralty Regulation and treated differently to the other warrant officers.¹⁸

All Royal Navy warrant officers were required to attain some level of literacy according to Admiralty Regulation, "No person shall be appointed to any station in which he is to have charge of stores, unless he can read and write, and is sufficiently skilled in arithmetic to keep an account of them correctly." Since warrant officers at all levels controlled a certain amount of the ship's stores, the regulation disqualified the illiterate.¹⁹ To a certain extent, the United States Army is not much different from the Royal Navy of yesteryear when it comes to assessing the

¹⁶Lavery, 103.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid., 100.

¹⁹Ibid.

intellectual capacity of service members for appointment into the warrant officer cohort.²⁰

Experience, expertise and initial education are all prerequisites.

The Beginning of Warrants Officers in the American Army

Warrant officers in the United States Army trace their origin to the headquarters clerks of 1896. These clerks were civil servant employees of different genders who worked at various locations throughout the Army.²¹ During World War I the American military increased in size so that by the time of the armistice in 1918 there were more than two million Soldiers deployed overseas. The United States Army recognized the need for technical experts who understood the administrative process within a military bureaucracy and the mechanization of paperwork provided by the typewriter.

In 1916, the United States Congress passed an Act that transferred all civil service headquarters clerks from the War Department to the Army. The law did not specify any qualifications or place a limit on who could become a field clerk, as long as they previously had been a headquarters clerk. Since the clerks were civilians, the law did not authorize a rank designation for the headquarters clerk or require salutes from the enlisted Soldiers. They did receive a new title of field clerk. The act also made the civil servant pay clerks of the Quartermaster Corps a part of the Army.

By 1917, some of the field clerks and pay clerks went overseas with the troops. Due to the continuous updating of regulations, the clerks wore a variation of an officer's uniform, but with enlisted insignia. The field and pay clerks were not pleased about wearing an enlisted

²⁰The United States Army requires a minimum score of 110 points on the General Technical (GT) part of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) to qualify for any of the diverse Warrant Officer Career fields. The GT score is determined by combining the word knowledge, paragraph comprehension, and the arithmetic reasoning parts of the ASVAB.

²¹William Emerson, *Encyclopedia of United States Army Insignia and Uniforms* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 298.

insignia on their uniform. They lobbied for, and received further regulation change that allowed them to continue wearing a variation of an officer's uniform but with their own unique insignia.²² From 1920 to 1926, no more field clerks were hired, and Congress did not appropriate funds to appoint more. On 27 April 1926, President Calvin Coolidge signed a bill granting warrant officer pay and allowances to the remaining field clerks in the Regular Army. The law did not require special qualifications or provide restrictions for warrant officers appointments.²³ The lack of restrictions allowed the appointment of the first two women warrant officers in the United States Army. Ms. Jean Doble and Ms. Olive Hoskins were the last females to receive a warrant officer appointment until World War II.²⁴

The same Congressional Act of 1920 expanded the use of warrant officers beyond the clerical field to include administrative and band leading activities.²⁵ The law further allowed warrant officers to receive a presidential appointment instead of a presidential commission. The overall intent of the expanding the use to warrant officers was "As a reward for enlisted personnel of long service and a haven for former commissioned officers of World War I who lacked either the education or other eligibility requirements to retain their commission after the war."²⁶

The Mine Planter Service

Before 1903, the Army Corps of Engineers were the experts in managing and maintaining coastal defenses, which consisted of sea based minefields. They employed civilian crews with non-military boats as the primary means to emplace the minefields. Eventually the Army transferred the responsibility for coastal defenses to the Army Coastal Artillery. The Coastal

²²Emerson, 387.

²³Ibid., 389.

²⁴Ibid. Each had approximately 20 years of service when appointed.

²⁵*Field Artillery Journal*, "Warranted Officers," September 1976, 36.

²⁶Ibid.

Artillery leadership grew tired of the constant friction between the military and civilian crew employees who staffed these vessels and sought an alternative solution.²⁷

On 9 July 1918, the United States Congress provided a solution by establishing the Army Mine Planter Service within the United States Army Coastal Artillery. It directed the appointment of warrant officers to serve on ships as masters, mates, chief engineers, and assistant engineers with all holding a singular warrant officer rank. The law further stipulated that the Secretary of War had the authority to appoint these officers, held their office or position at his discretion, and that the term “commissioned officer” includes active duty warrant officers. Additionally, the legislation instructs, “Warrant officers shall have such allowances as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and shall be retired, and shall receive longevity pay, as now prescribed by law for officers of the Army.”²⁸ That date, 9 July 1918, is the official birth date of the U.S. Army Warrant Officer Corps.

A New Era for Army Warrant Officers Begins

From 1922 to 1936, there were very few new warrant officer appointments. Nevertheless, things started to change. During this period the Army began administering competitive examinations to replenish lists of qualified service members to become warrant officers. In 1936, the Army appointed a few qualified enlisted aspirants from the examination list. By 1940, a significant number of Soldiers were attaining warrant officer rank. This increase was the first since 1922, but the overall strength of warrant officers did not increase because many warrant

²⁷Ramon Jackson, “Army Ships-The Ghost Fleet,” <http://patriot.net/~eastlnd2/army-amps.htm> (accessed 1 May 2012).

²⁸*The United States Army Appropriations Act of 1918*, “...sets the annual pay for warrant officers in the following positions: Boat Masters, \$1,800; first mates, \$1,320; second mates, \$972; chief engineers, \$1700; assistant engineers, \$1,200”.

officers transferred to the commissioned officer ranks. Many of the warrant officers who transferred were rated pilots eligible for lieutenant rank in the Air Corps.²⁹

In 1941, the 77th United States Congress in Public Law 230 enacted three changes to the Warrant Officer Corps. The first change authorized two grades of warrant officers. The two new warrant grades were chief warrant officer and warrant officer junior grade. The second change was to authorize the War Department to establish a flight officer and corresponding flight pay.³⁰ The final change in the new law gave the Secretary of the Army the authority to assign a warrant officer with duties normally performed by a commissioned officer, and vested the warrant officer with the same powers as commissioned officers. By the commencement of World War II, commanders were appointing warrant officers into forty different occupational fields. In 1944, Congress authorized the direct appointment of female warrant officers. Forty-two female warrant officers were on active duty by the end of the war.³¹

As World War I ended, the process for the appointment of warrant officers made a dramatic turn. There were no centralized selection processes for warrant officers. Commanders appointed warrant officers according to their units' needs. The appointment of warrant officers went from being a reward to an incentive. This incentive made becoming a warrant officer the capstone rank for enlisted service, and produced mixed results. The decentralization of the warrant officer selection process created confusion on the purpose of warrant officers. Warrant officers became interchangeable with junior commissioned officers or senior enlisted personnel

²⁹*Field Artillery Journal*, "Warranted Officers," September 1976, 36.

³⁰Institute of Heraldry, Insignia of Grade - Warrant Officers, *War Department Circular 366*, November 7, 1942, established a flight officer with the insignia the same, as the warrant officer junior grade except the enamel was blue. The position of Flight Officer was subsequently abolished in 1945, http://www.tioh.hqda.pentagon.mil/UniformedServices/Insignia_Rank/warrant_officers.aspx, (accessed 1 May 2012).

³¹*Field Artillery Journal*, "Warranted Officers," September 1976, 36.

and no procedure existed to maintain or achieve the proper personnel strength for individual warrant officer career fields throughout the Army.

The Eighty-First United States Congress provided a solution when it passed Public Law 351, better known as the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Congress amended the law with the Career Compensation Act of 1954 to fix shortcomings of the 1949 legislation. These laws retained the designation of warrant officer junior grade, which eventually became just warrant officer and kept the rank of chief warrant officer. The grade of chief warrant officer became the pay rates of W2, W3, and W4. Ultimately, the three new pay rates become grades that are still in use today. However, these two laws did nothing to correct the problems with the use of warrant officers. The process of defining the proper use of warrant officers began with an Army study began in 1953 that regulated the roles of its warrant officers.³²

In 1957, the Army published the results of the 1953 warrant officer study. The study proposed a new concept for the retention of the warrant officers, and for the continuation of the Warrant Officer Corps. It recommended that a warrant officer grade is not a reward or incentive for the enlisted or for former commissioned officers. It defined the warrant officers as, “A highly skilled technician who is provided to fill those positions above the enlisted level which are too specialized in scope to permit the effective development and continued utilization of broadly trained branch qualified commissioned officers.” In 1960, the Army published the Department of the Army (DA) Circular 611-7 to codify the recommendations of the 1953 study, and it remains the basis for the current United States Army Warrant Officer Program.

The Modern Era for the Army Warrant Officer Corps

In 1985, the Army published DA Pamphlet 600-11, *Warrant Officer Professional Development*. The pamphlet provided a clear definition of a warrant officer. It stated that a

³²Ibid.

warrant officer is, “An officer appointed by warrant by the Secretary of the Army, based upon a sound level of technical and tactical competence. The warrant officer is the highly skilled expert and trainer, who, by gaining progressive levels of expertise and leadership, operates, maintains, administers, and manages the Army’s equipment, support activities, or technical systems for an entire career.” In another 1985 DA study found that, warrant officer’s technical expertise was not the only characteristic needed to meet the demands of the Army’s current and future doctrine. The report recommended the Army require the Warrant Officer Corps to embrace the need to be proficient in basic tactical and leadership skills as well.

In 1987, Congress changed United States Code, Title 10, *Armed Forces* to provide for the commissioning of warrant officers. The purpose of this change was to standardize the processes used by the different services to appoint warrant officers. The principal outcomes were to give warrant officers the authority to administer the oath of office, assign certain warrant officers as commanding officers with the ability to impose non-judicial punishment under Article 15, and to make service as a commissioned warrant officer equate to overall commissioned service. All these changes in the law only applied to the chief warrant officers (CW2, 3, 4), not warrant officers (WO1).³³

Over the years, there were further improvements in the Army warrant officer education program. These improvements included provided intermediate level formal training in fifty-three individual specialties and formal training for twenty-seven specialties at the advanced level. There was delineation in the Warrant Officer Education that consisted of entry, advanced, and the senior level with the establishment of a Warrant Officer Senior Course. Former Army Chief of Staff General John Wickham commissioned the Army Total Warrant Officer Study with the

³³U. S. Department of the Army, “The Army Training and Leader Development Panel ATLDP Phase III – Warrant Officer Study Final Report, 2002” (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2002), WO1-2.

result being a cessation of direct appointments to warrant officer and the establishment of the Warrant Officer Entry Course a requirement for all new warrant officer candidates. Other improvements to warrant officer education climaxed with the 1992 Warrant Officer Leader Development Plan (WOLDAP).³⁴

In 1992, the WOLDAP received approval for implementation from Army Chief of Staff General Gordon Sullivan. The purpose was to combine all the various initiatives into a single unified personnel management system for the Army Warrant Officers. It is a total Army plan that appointed, trained, and utilized active and reserve component warrant officers to a common standard. Some of the other goals of the WOLDAP were to establish a warrant officer education system consisting of a Warrant Officer Candidate Course for warrant officer candidates (pre-appointment phase), and a Warrant Officer Basic Course for warrant officer one (entry level). In addition, a Warrant Officer Advance Course for chief warrant officer two/three (advanced level), a Warrant Officer Staff Course for chief warrant officer four (senior level), and the apex for all warrant officers a Warrant Officer Senior Staff Course targeted towards chief warrant officer fives (master level). Finally, the WOLDAP approved the establishment of the Warrant Officer Career College and proposed civilian education goals for the various warrant officer ranks.³⁵

The Army, in the most recent version of DA Pamphlet 600-3 (2008), published the latest definition of what a warrant officer is. It states that, “The Army warrant officer is a self-aware and adaptive technical expert, combat leader, trainer, and advisor. Through progressive levels of expertise in assignments, training, and education, the warrant officer administers, manages, maintains, operates, and integrates Army systems and equipment across the full spectrum of Army operations. Warrant officers are innovative integrators of emerging technologies, dynamic

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid.

teachers, confident warfighters, and developers of specialized teams of soldiers. Warrant officers support a wide-range of Army missions throughout their career. The Army assesses warrant officers for specific levels of technical ability. The Army ensures that warrant officers refine their technical expertise and develop their leadership and management skills through tiered progressive assignments and education.

The present day Warrant Corps is a group of technical and tactical experts comprising over twenty-seven thousand officers that make up approximately fourteen percent of the total United States Army officer corps.³⁶ By 2002, active duty warrant officers and fifty-six percent of reserve component warrant officers had achieved the equivalent of two years of undergraduate education. American Army warrant officers have demonstrated not only technical proficiency, but also tactical competency. This success, and the critical role of warrant officers throughout the history of the Army resulted in the admission of a few into the prestigious Advanced School of Military Studies (AMSP).³⁷

Section 3: Advanced Military Studies Program (AMSP)

United States Army Warrant Officers are a wealth of knowledge, experience, and adaptability. They have performed admirably since the establishment of the Warrant Officer Corps on 9 July 1918. The expectation within the Army is for these officers to be technical experts, combat leaders, trainers, and advisors in integrating emerging technologies in support of all types of Army operations. A select few perform outside of their career fields and work in

³⁶The Fiscal Year 2011 United States Army G1 Demographics Profile show that active duty warrant officers number 15,853 or three percent of all active duty officers. The demographic study shows that warrant officers in the National Guard number 8,230 and are two percent of all National Guard officers and Army Reserve warrant officers total 3,178 and are two percent of Army Reserve officers. http://www.armyg1.army.mil/hr/docs/demographics/FY11_ARMY_PROFILE.pdf (accessed 1 May 2012)

³⁷Craig Martin, "Warrant Officers Show Why They Belong in SAMS," *Fort Leavenworth Lamp*, 7 Oct. 2010, <http://www.ftleavenworthlamp.com/perspective/commentary/x1868326686/Warrant-officers-show-why-they-belong-in-SAMS> (accessed 1 April 2012).

functional or branch immaterial positions. These positions are important to the overall Army because they encompass areas of leader development, professional development, personnel management, training, and training development. Beginning in 2010, warrant officers were eligible to attend the AMSP. Prior to this date, the AMSP has only admitted Majors and a few Lieutenant Colonels. Warrant officers are well prepared to meet the growing demand throughout the operational force for AMSP educated officers.

Creating Adaptive Leaders

GEN Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently participated in a podcast with many senior officers in the United States military discussing the importance of developing leadership within the Army along. In the podcast, GEN Dempsey spoke about how the contemporary operating environment was not the same as the one he experienced earlier in his career. He emphasized that in the past, the enemy was easier to template than the enemies the United States is currently facing and projected to encounter in the future. The majority of these future threats are not the motorized rifle regiments with inflexible tactics and rigid movement tables that he studied in his military education courses. The new enemy is adaptable and looks for every advantage to defeat United States efforts around the world. According to Dempsey, “What we need is a group of leaders, that is officers, noncommissioned officers, warrant officers, and civilian leaders . . . who can adapt when we get the future a few degrees of separation off from what we anticipated it to be.”³⁸

It is not a coincidence that GEN Dempsey mentioned warrant officers when explaining that leaders must be responsive to counter the actions of an innovative enemy. However, there is something more fundamental to what GEN Dempsey was discussing. GEN Dempsey’s

³⁸“*About Leadership: ADP 6-22*,” by Command and General Staff College, Center for Army Leadership, <http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/cgsc/events/ADP622/> (accessed 7 August 2012).

visualization is of an Army that has been in persistent conflict for over ten years against an enemy operating mainly inside of Iraqi and Afghanistan. He uses the term the “Profession of Arms” and highlights some of those attributes required to excel in it as, possessing expert knowledge, a commitment to continuing education, a certain set of values, and the idea of service being paramount. In over ninety years of existence, the warrant officers corps has exercised all of the traits GEN Dempsey mentioned to include adaptability and the flexibility to stay relevant to the demands of an always-evolving Army.

Retired MG Robert Scales has similar ideas about the benefits of having an educated military force. MG Scales believes that soldiers learned post-Vietnam that superior technology could not single-handedly ensure victory. MG Scales accuses the Army of forgetting the lessons of Vietnam and focusing on developing a war-fighting organization based on mechanization and operational maneuver warfare at the expense of professional development and education. MG Scales saw an American ground force organized with brigade formations having the capability to interdict, defeat, and destroy a Soviet armored thrust with aerial platforms reinforced by long-range cannon and rocket artillery. The Israeli experience in the 1973 Yom Kippur War and eventually the overwhelming success of the 1991 Gulf War seemed to validate the arguments in support of having all these types of capabilities.

Both Dempsey and Scales agree that America’s enemies understand that American armed forces dominate the domains of air, land, sea, and space. The enemy as described by both GEN Dempsey and MG Scales is one that has learned that fighting the American Army directly is not advantageous to their survival or achieving their objectives. The enemy wants to employ asymmetric tactics while maneuvering in complex terrain that includes the jungle, mountains, and in cities to overcome the technological advantages of the American Army. The enemy believes it has parity with American forces at the squad and platoon level. There is a need to delegate decision making to lower levels to match the new enemies focus. There is, however a problem

within the cognitive realm of senior leaders, who do not feel comfortable delegating decisions to subordinates that were that traditionally were under their purview. Another problem is subordinates having sufficient comprehension of the magnitude of making complex decisions.

These two men propose a revolution that creates a combination of training and learning that prepares military leaders to fight this new freethinking enemy. In his essay, MG Scales referred to this new way of educating our military as a “learning revolution.” He believed that training only prepares the soldier to deal with the known, while education prepares the service member to handle unexpected situations in an uncertain environment. Scales believed that the modern military combatant must continue to follow orders; however, the warrior must also demonstrate resourcefulness, initiative, creativity, and inventiveness, all routine attributes that the modern battlefield demands.

In a similar vein, GEN Dempsey warned that “Today’s uncertainty is the result of persistent conflict with hybrid threats, enabled by technology that decentralize, network, and syndicate “ and “In such an environment, we should expect to be surprised more frequently and with potentially greater impact.” The Army needs leaders who possess imagination and understand that adaptability is more important to solving future problems than the capacity to wage war with firepower and combat systems. GEN Dempsey and MG Scales’ arguments for the higher education of officers to produce these attributes has been a focus of study since at least the last century.³⁹

Since the 1970s, the Army has recognized the existence of three pillars that support the development of the military officer. The first pillar is the formal mandatory schools an officer is required to attend. The second pillar is a combination of education, training, and experience an

³⁹Martin Dempsey, “Win. Learn. Focus. Adapt. Win Again,” *AUSA Compilation of General Dempsey’s Speeches* (2011), http://www.ausa.org/publications/ilw/ilw_pubs/specialreports/Documents/Dempsey_web.pdf, (accessed 15 May 2012).

officer receives during the practice of his profession. Finally, the third pillar is the self-development every officer pursues throughout the entirety of his or her career. The goal of these three pillars is to produce a competent, confident officer that is able to exploit the full potential of the United States military against any adversary. The AMSP is one of those courses designed to encompass parts of all three pillars with the purpose of exposing a select group of officers to military history, theory, tactics, operational art, and foster self-development.

The Origins of the AMSP

In 1983, AMSP became a one-year extension of the Command and General Staff College (CGSC). Senior Army officers realized the need for a course to study the complexities of operational art with more intellectual rigor than other military schools. Admittance to the program was only to a carefully selected number of O-grade officers. The curriculum focused on history, theory, tactics, and operational art. Upon graduation, these officers went immediately into key assignments within Army Service Component Commands, Corps, and Divisions to apply their special talents and training. The intent was to leverage the educational experience of these officers and increase the competency of others throughout the force. The expectation for an AMSP graduate was and is for them to lead teams in planning military operations. Graduates must develop a high level of skill to apply operational art and science to problem solving. The AMSP graduates demonstrate critical and creative thinking skills, and are proficient in communicating effectively through various media.

The first AMSP class of twelve pupils convened in the summer of 1983, and met in an old converted gymnasium on Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The original plan was to produce forty-six AMSP graduates per year. However, by 1985, the demand for AMSP graduates had increased across the Army, and the annual student population grew to fifty-two students. The program has been so successful that demand for AMSP graduates has continued to grow. In 1987, the United

States Air Force enrolled its first student followed by the Marine Corps in 1988. International officers began attending in 1998. In 2010, the Army allowed matriculation of the first three warrant officers into AMSP. In 2011, AMSP increased the course output and it is now producing 144 graduates per academic year filling one-hundred five Tier 1 assignments for Army requirements.⁴⁰ A Tier 1 assignment is an assignment to a division or corps level staff.

There will always be a demand for AMSP graduates in excess of production. The Headquarters Department of the Army, G3/5/7 is the proponent for the AMSP. The G3/5/7 has set a goal of producing one-hundred five AMSP graduates from Fort Leavenworth (calendar years 2012 to 2014) to meet the demands from the operational Army for filling Tier I assignments. These Tier I assignments are the traditional postings AMSP graduates go to for their utilization tours. In calendar year (CY) 2011, thirty-one percent of AMSP graduates went on a Worldwide Individual Augmentation System (WIAS) tasking. According to analysis by the G3/5/7, the use of AMSP graduates for WIAS postings is resulting in unfilled traditional Tier I positions. This situation violates the Army Chief of Staff's staffing guidance to maintain theater committed forces at one hundred percent strength.

Even with AMSP producing one hundred and five graduates per CY a shortfall of AMSP graduates to fill the demand by the operational Army will continue.⁴¹ One reason for the shortfall of AMSP qualified officers throughout the operational force is utilization tour. Historically up to ten AMSP graduates make the Centrally Selected List (CSL) for battalion command and go straight to battalion command without ever serving an initial AMSP Tier 1 assignment.

Additionally, some branches or functional areas have fenced off a number of the one hundred and

⁴⁰Each year the Army G3/5/7 attempts to fill one hundred and eight Tier 1 assignments. One hundred and five graduates from AMSP, and three from the other service schools. The other thirty-nine SAMS AMSP graduates are sister service, IA, IMS, and SOF/ARNG positions.

⁴¹U.S. Department of the Army, *2011 Advanced Military Studies Program Tier One Distribution Policy* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2010), 2, 4, 6.

five slots. Special Forces officers attend AMSP and serve their utilization tour in a special operations organization regardless of the shortfall in the conventional Army.⁴² As a result, demand for AMSP graduates in traditional Tier 1 assignments will continue to exceed production. Sending warrant officers to AMSP can certainly help fill this gap. The question is, can warrants meet the entry requirements?

Analyzing the AMSP Prerequisites

The AMSP has stringent prerequisites for applicants. Applicants must possess at least a bachelor's degree and have completed the intermediate level professional military education. Since a bachelor's degree is not a requirement for most warrant officers, and they attend different intermediate level education courses than O-grade officers, a comparison of the differences between O-grade and warrant officers' typical educational background follows.

Civilian Education

In the current Officer Education System (OES), O-grade officers have more civilian undergraduate education opportunities than warrant officers. An individual has four distinct tracks to becoming an Army O-grade officer. The four officer producing programs are Officer Candidate School (OCS), West Point Military Academy, Reserve Officers Training Program (ROTC), or by receiving a direct commission. All four require a bachelor's degree prior to commissioning. According to the Army G1 2011 Demographic Profile, out of 81,698 active component O-grade officers, seven percent (5,718) of O-grade officers only have a high school diploma, so ninety-three percent of O-grade officers have a bachelor's degree and potentially are eligible to enter AMSP.

⁴²Ibid.

Only two methods exist for individuals to become an active component warrant officer, many of the branches require minimal upper level education for accessing individuals into the warrant officer corps. All technical service warrant officers and aviator aspirants attend the Warrant Officer Candidate School (WOCS) at Fort Rucker, Alabama (Special Forces hosts their own WOCS at Fort Bragg, NC.). Within the fifteen proponents, there are forty-two warrant officer Military Occupational Skills (MOS). Only five of the proponents make having an associate's degree a minimum prerequisite for their program. The rest either require less college to apply for appointment, or make college education an application preference.

Even though college education is not a broad requirement, twenty-two percent of all warrant officers in the active Army (3,487 of 15,853) have at least a bachelor's degree. Since 2009, Army G1 demographics show that the percentage of warrant officers having a bachelor's degree has not changed significantly. Despite the smaller percentage of warrant officers holding bachelor degrees (relative to O-grade officers), there still is a significant warrant officer population that meets this educational prerequisite for attending AMSP.

Comparing O-grade and warrant officer civilian education acknowledges the differences between the two cohorts but underscores the large viable population of warrant officers that meet the education requirements for attending AMSP. If only five percent of warrant officers who have a bachelor's degree apply to AMSP, there is a total pool of 174 potential candidates for attendance. This data shows that the warrant officer cohort can provide at least one warrant officer per class.⁴³

⁴³Two slots per academic year dedicated for warrant officers is less than five percent (7.2 personnel) of the maximum number of AMSP graduates.

Military Education

Since the completion of Professional Military Education (PME) is a requirement for attending AMSP, an analysis of the differences in PME for both O-grade officers and warrant officers reveals more of the compatibility of warrant officers for AMSP. The first experience at PME for O-grade officers is attendance at the Basic Officers' Leadership Course (BOLC). BOLC varies in duration depending on the branch of service of the O-grade officer to a maximum of eighteen weeks. The purpose of BOLC is to make new Army officers into technically competent and confident platoon leaders, regardless of branch, grounded in leadership, physically and mentally strong, and instilled with the warrior ethos.

The comparable entry level PME of BOLC for warrant officers is the Warrant Officer Basic Course (WOBC). The WOBCs are branch-specific qualification courses. Each branch is responsible for developing its own curriculum. The purpose of WOBC is to ensure that newly appointed warrant officers receive the MOS-specific training and technical certification needed to perform at the platoon through brigade levels. The duration of each WOBC varies in length from a few weeks to some being a yearlong.

The next PME course for the O-grade officer is the six-month Captains Career Course (CCC). The CCC prepares company grade officers to command Soldiers at the company, troop, or battery level, and to serve as staff officers at battalion and brigade levels. Army Regulation (AR) 600-3 recommends that O-grade officers attend the CCC after promotion to captain and before company command. The same regulation states the goal of the CCC is to development leader competencies while integrating recent operational experiences with institutional training while reinforcing the value of lifelong learning and self-development. The CCC completion is a requirement for an O-grade to attend Intermediate Level Education (ILE).

The equivalent of the CCC for warrant officers is the Warrant Officer Advance Course (WOAC). The WOAC is a combination of common core and proponent training that prepares the

warrant officer to serve in senior positions at the CW3 level. The WOAC builds upon the skills, knowledge, and attributes developed through previous training and experience. Additionally, the course exposes warrant officers to leader, tactical, and technical training needed to serve in company and higher-level positions. The length of each WOAC varies in length and the proponent dictates the course requirements. CW2s are eligible to attend their specific WOAC and warrant officers selected for CW3 are to attend the course within a year after promotion.

The yearlong Intermediate Level Education (ILE) is the final O-grade PME before attending AMSP. AR 600-3 describes ILE as the Army's formal education program for Majors. ILE prepares new Majors for their next ten years of service by infusing them a warrior ethos and an understanding of joint, expeditionary, and war-fighting doctrine. The Army has mandated starting in 2005 all Majors must attend ILE and complete it before their fifteenth year of commissioned service. There is a sixteen-week alternative course at satellite locations for Majors who cannot attend the resident ILE course for operational reasons. The expectation of all ILE-complete Majors is that they possess the technical, tactical, and leadership competencies to be successful at the more senior levels of the military throughout the rest of their careers. Moreover, an ILE complete Major may compete for admission into AMSP.

The warrant officer ILE equivalent PME is a combination of two courses. They are the Warrant Officer Staff Course (WOSC) and the Warrant Officer Senior Staff Course (WOSSC), both taught at Fort Rucker, Alabama. Completion of these courses is the equivalent of an O-grade officer finishing ILE and it permits the warrant officer to apply for AMSP. The WOSC is a five-week professional development course with an additional forty-seven hour self-paced Distance Learning (DL) component. The WOSC provides Intermediate Level Professional Military Education and Leader Development (PME-LD) by focusing on staff officer and leadership skills needed to serve in the grade of Chief Warrant Officer Four (CW4) at battalion and higher levels. CW3s and newly promoted CW4s are the target audience for attendance at the WOSC.

The WOSSC is a four-week resident course with a forty-eight hour DL portion. The purpose of the WOSSC is providing, “Senior CW4s or new Chief Warrant Officer Fives (CW5) with the master-level education, knowledge, and influential leadership skills necessary to apply their technical expertise in support of leaders on strategic level JIIM staffs during unified land operations.” All CW3s and newly promoted CW4s/Chief Warrant Officer Fives (CW5) are the target audience for attendance at the WOSSC.

Warrant officer AMSP applicants receive ILE credit for attending both the WOSC and WOSSC. There is some question whether the combined nine-week WOCC educational experience compares to information covered to the one-year ILE education. The combined nine-week WOCC education is even less than the alternative sixteen-week ILE. The ILE common core (five months) and Advanced Operations Course (three months) portion of ILE are the required portions of ILE that relate to AMSP application. The warrant officer courses, distance learning, and experience overcome much of the difference in the lengths of PME service colleges for the right AMSP applicants. The traditional technical services warrant officer has served a total of sixteen years by the time the soldier is eligible to apply to AMSP.⁴⁴ In contrast, the typical officer has at least ten years of active service and no more than fifteen. The additional six years of experience make up for the shorter PME completed by similarly qualified warrant officer applicants.

⁴⁴Looking at the same TIG situation for warrant officers shows that the length of time in each rank before promotion to the next is longer than it is for O-grade officers. The generic timeline presented is in reference to technical service warrant officers, not aviator warrant officers. Warrant officers must have at least two years as a WO1 before promotion to CW2. A CW2 must have at least three years in grade before promotion to CW3. A CW3 must have a minimum of three years TIG before promotion to CW4. The minimal promotion timeline presented for warrant officers equates to a total of eight years of warrant officer service. The important difference between the both groups is that the typical warrant officer had eight years of service before applying for the warrant officer program. This means that a warrant officer probably has at least sixteen years of service, which is a lot closer to a twenty-year retirement than the O-grade officer.

Key Developmental Positions Post AMSP

Another area that supports warrant officer AMSP attendance has to do with post AMSP Key Developmental (KD) positions. Most branches and some functional areas identify positions as KD for Majors. These KD positions assist with developing the core branch or functional competencies and are critical to providing the necessary experience to develop successful future senior leaders. Some branches and functional areas have specific timelines for receiving credit at the conclusion of those KD positions.

A typical field grade KD tour will normally be twenty-four months in duration, extended up to thirty-six months by exception only. Units must release these officers after completing their KD assignment to either attend Professional Military Education (PME) or meet requirements by the generating force. However, the AMSP utilization tour will not impede an officer's promotion potential. If an officer is at risk of not completing at least 24 months of KD time before the Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Board then the Army will reduce the length of the AMSP utilization assignment to facilitate KD time.

An example is Armor Branch graduates from AMSP. The Armor Branch stipulates in AR 600-3 that, "The Division Chief of Plans position is considered a key developmental experience for an AMSP graduated Armor officer when served in conjunction with at least twelve months service in a battalion/squadron or brigade/regimental operations officer/executive officer position." The consequence of the Armor Branch decision is that the typical AMSP educated O-grade armor officer is able to achieve twenty-four months of KD time.

Some of the other branches allow AMSP educated majors to get KD credit while at the same time finishing their required one-year AMSP utilization tour. Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) branch allows the duality of receiving credit for KD positioning while also fulfilling the obligatory AMSP utilization tour. The result is that all AMSP qualified Majors have twelve to twenty-four months to meet the branch's requirements including

the one-year AMSP utilization tour with no further requirement to serve in another AMSP position. This issue of post AMSP timelines does not affect the AMSP warrant officer graduates.

There is no requirement for Army warrant officers to complete KD positions. Warrant officers spend their entire careers in broadening positions without time limits to develop the technical and tactical competencies that allow them to succeed. After graduation, a warrant officer can spend his AMSP utilization tour plus another two years as an AMSP planner within any organization, since normal tour of duty is three years. Additionally, AMSP warrant officers can spend the rest of their careers fulfilling subsequent AMSP planner positions without any detrimental effect on their promotion prospects. While every year a new group of Majors arrive and depart to continue their careers. The longer rotation schedule provided an increase in organizational effectiveness due to the retention of institutional knowledge, and a decrease of unfilled traditional Tier 1 assignments.

Summary

There are significant benefits to warrant officers attending AMSP. The AMSP is an excellent opportunity to develop warrant officers into adaptable leaders able to counter the actions of an innovative adversary. The AMSP education prepares warrant officers to handle unexpected situations originating from an uncertain environment. Sending WOs to AMSP can at least partially address the annual shortage of graduates because WOs career progression will enable them to stay in position longer after graduation, and to take more subsequent Tier 1 jobs that require AMSP graduates. Warrant officers have the education and the experience to take advantage of the concepts covered in AMSP. While there are strong arguments for warrant officers to attend AMSP, there are also reasons to question this policy.

Section 4: Arguments against Warrant Officers at AMSP

The AMSP mission is to educate members of our Armed Forces, our Allies, and Interagency at the graduate-level to become agile and adaptive leaders who are critical and creative thinkers who produce viable options to solve operational and strategic problems.⁴⁵ According to the Academic Year 2011-2012 AMSP Program Guide, some of the expectations for AMSP graduates are that they possess the ability to lead teams in support of military operations and are good teammates. Commands receiving AMSP graduates anticipate effective planners who can apply operational art and science. Graduates must demonstrate critical and creative thinking to develop solutions to contemporary operational problems using Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Multinational (JIIM) approaches. Additionally, graduates understand the complexities of past and future operational environments and communicate effectively over many mediums.

What Does the Army Want from its Warrant Officers?

The first argument against sending warrant officers to AMSP is that the Army wants warrant officers to be highly specialized experts and trainers in their own narrow career fields. Warrant officers must remain single-specialty officers with career tracks that progress within their field, unlike their O-grade counterparts who focus on increased levels of command and staff duty positions.

The argument is only partially valid. It rests on an outdated understanding of what a warrant officer is, as highlighted by a review of the Army's definition of a warrant officer. According to DA PAM 600-3 (2010), a warrant officer, "Is a self-aware and adaptive technical

⁴⁵U.S. Department of the Army, *School of Advanced Military Studies Program Guide* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2011), 7.

expert, combat leader, trainer, and advisor. Through progressive levels of expertise in assignments, training, and education, the warrant officer administers, manages, maintains, operates, and integrates Army systems and equipment across the full range of Army operations. Warrant officers are innovative integrators of emerging technologies, dynamic teachers, confident warfighters, and developers of specialized teams of soldiers. They support a wide range of Army missions throughout their careers.”⁴⁶

Warrant officers are generally single-track officers, specialists in their particular career field. For example, there are warrant officer pilots that fly the various aircraft found within the United States Army inventory. The Army expects these warrant officer pilots to operate and command these aircraft under tactical and non-tactical conditions during all types of meteorological conditions during the day, night, and under night vision systems. At the same time, however, the Aviation Branch wants these warrant officer pilots to prove their level of technical expertise by achieving Pilot in Command (PIC) status, and then meet the requirements for attaining the Senior Aviator Badge. Eventually their goal is Master Aviator standing. Each one of these steps in reaching a level of proficiency requires flight time, passing examinations, and meeting the requirements of being an Army officer in the Aviation Branch that support the gambit of Army operations.⁴⁷

An example of those other requirements the Aviation Branch makes warrant officer pilots complete are courses like the Tactical Operations (TACOPS) Officer course. The TACOPS course prepares the warrant officer pilot to assist the ground or air commander and the operations officers in the planning, coordinating, briefing, and executing tactical Army Aviation and warfare in a combined/joint environment. Additionally, the warrant officer provides commanders

⁴⁶U.S. Department of the Army, Army Regulation 600-3, *Officer Professional Development, and Career Management* (2010), www.apd.army.mil/pdffiles/p600_3.pdf, (1 May 2012).

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 91.

technical/tactical expertise in Army airspace command and control (A2C2), personnel recovery, electronic warfare (EW), threat analysis, digital operations, and joint tactics, techniques, and procedures. The TACOPS officer develops, implements, and manages the Personnel Recovery, Aviation Mission Planning Systems (AMPS), Fratricide, Threat Analysis, and Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) programs. The level of command the TACOPS officer finds himself working in is immaterial. In the position of TACOPS officer, the warrant officer would be much more effective if he had the AMSP education in operational art. The AMSP education provides a TACOPS officer the same benefit as it provides O-grade AMSP graduate planners, the ability to think critically and creatively in the application of operational art. This increased ability amplifies the warrant officer's expertise in flying and in the planning the employment of aviation assets. The warrant officer pilot/AMSP graduate is more able to use his technical flying expertise and ability to problem-solve to assist the command with achieving their mission.⁴⁸

Warrant officers do not need a graduate education

Another argument against sending warrant officers to AMSP says that warrant officers do not need a graduate level education. DA PAM 600-3 (2010) provides support to the argument that the Army never intended for warrant officers to have a graduate level of education. The regulation makes having an undergraduate or graduate degree immaterial for the majority of warrant officers to achieve.⁴⁹ There are exceptions, for example, candidates applying to become warrant officers in the Criminal Investigations Command (CID) must possess a bachelor's degree or must submit an application waiver.

Warrant officers are not required to have a degree for career success; however, the Army does allow degree completion by a small number of warrant officers. Considering circumstantial

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid., 21.

evidence, regulations, education requirements, and programs, it is easy to see how misunderstanding the lack of a requirement for warrant officers to have undergraduate degrees could occur. However, not requiring warrant officers to possess an undergraduate or graduate degree is not the same as saying that warrant officers possessing undergraduate and graduate degrees would not benefit the Army.

The real objection has more to do with understanding the purpose of what a graduate education provides. Professor John E. Ebel from Boston College describes the rationale behind getting a graduate education is to provide, “Students with more advanced learning in a specialized discipline or sub-discipline. Graduate school gives an in-depth understanding such that the student becomes something of an expert in the topic of study. A good graduate program also teaches advanced skills in such areas as problem solving, mathematics, writing, oral presentation, and technology, each as applied to the particular field of study.” Professor Ebel believes that undergraduate school provides a broad education while the reason for graduate school is to make students into team members that can carry out advanced research. He further asserts that graduate school may not make the student a team leader, but that the eventual purpose is for the pupil to learn material for professional use.⁵⁰

A master’s level education is complementary to the purpose of having warrant officers. By comparing the definition of a warrant officer with the reasons Professor Ebel gives for graduate education, the linkage becomes clear. The Army wants its warrant officers to be self-aware and adaptive leaders that through progressive levels of experience and education can administer, manage, employ, and integrate the various systems that can allow their units to accomplish their mission. A graduate degree teaches the advanced skills in

⁵⁰John E. Ebel, “FAQ: Applying to Graduate School,” Boston College Website, <http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/offices/careers/pdf/gradschool.pdf> (accessed 1 September 2012).

problem solving by exposing the individual to mathematics, writing, oral presentations, and technology.⁵¹ These subjects taught at the graduate level amplify the warrant officer's experience and expertise, and makes the Army's technical experts even more effective. Since the Army considers all officers direct representatives of the President of the United States, warrant officers must have the same educational opportunities as the O-grade officers to operate at that level of government where working within the unknown is common.⁵²

Filling O-grade staff positions with Warrant Officers

Another argument against AMSP educated warrant officers is the concern that the Army is going to replace O-grade officers with warrants, reducing the number of slots available to O-grade officers. Under the current selection process the AMSP Director selects either an O-grade officer or a warrant officer to occupy one slot. There are no dedicated warrant officer slots in the AMSP. However, the Army G3/5/7 has no plans to convert AMSP O-grade slots into warrant officer positions. In addition, none of the branches or functional areas has identified AMSP slots for warrant officers within AR 600-3, as they have for the O-grade officers. This is not to say that in the future the G3/5/7 might take the recommendation from the Congressional Budget Office and convert the coding of AMSP slots for warrant officers.⁵³

The flexibility AMSP warrant officers provide to the personnel management system may also be detrimental to the promotion potential of O-grade officers. SAMS is quick to cite

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²U.S. Department of the Army, Army Regulation 600-3, *Officer Professional Development, and Career Management* (2010), 134, www.apd.army.mil/pdffiles/p600_3.pdf, (1 May 2012).

⁵³The Congressional Budget Office (2002) wrote a paper that supported a proposition for the military to make greater use of warrant officers throughout the force because it can relieve some of the pressures in recruiting and retention, the managing of personnel, and provide a cost effective alternative to using O-grade officers for some positions.

the fact that many of its AMSP graduates go on to successfully command at many echelons. In 2008, the school touted fifty-five active flag officers as former pupils with many more residing in the retirement rolls.⁵⁴ The Armor Branch at HRC provided data that showed the recent promotion board selected nine of ten AMSP Armor officers for promotion to the rank of LTC, well above the nominal selection rate.⁵⁵ Warrant officers are competing directly with O-grade officers for limited seats at AMSP under the current selection system. For every warrant officer that attends AMSP an O-grade officer cannot complete a course that promotion boards view very favorably.

Another potential impact on the promotion potential of O-grade officers is the limitation of O-grade officers by U.S. Code. According to the Army G1, there are 81,698 O-grade officers on active duty. In turn, U.S. Code limits the Army to approximately 18,825 majors, 9,915 lieutenant colonels, and 3,814 colonels.⁵⁶ The U.S. Code does not limit the amount of warrant officers on active duty. The exception being that no more than five percent of the warrant officer total population can be of the rank of CW5.⁵⁷ This is a possible statutory method for the Army to replace O-grades with warrant officers and use the rationale of “cost savings.” This could result in a cost-saving move by the Army to utilize either a CW3 or CW4 instead of a major or lieutenant colonel.⁵⁸

⁵⁴Jeffery J. Goble, “Wants and Needs: SAMS’ Relationship with the Army,” (Monograph, School of Advanced Military Studies, 2008), 23.

⁵⁵CPT Thomas Spolizino, Future Readiness Officer, Armor Branch, e-mail message to author, 12 October 2012.

⁵⁶Authorized Strengths: Commissioned Officers on Active Duty in grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, U.S. Code 10 (2012), § 523.

⁵⁷Warrant Officer; Grades, U.S. Code 10 (2012), § 571.

⁵⁸According to the 2012 U.S. Military Pay Scale with 18 years of service being the equalizer for both O-grades and warrants, the base pay for a major is \$7162, a lieutenant colonel is \$7982, a CW3 is \$5554, and a CW4 is \$6084.

Warrants Do Not Seem to Fit the AMSP Utilization Tour Model

Another possible argument against sending warrant officers to AMSP is that warrant officers do not fit well into the AMSP utilization model for O-grade officers. The AMSP model is for the third year to be both a utilization tour and an internship for the O-grade officers.⁵⁹ At the conclusion of the final year, the officer moves on to another assignment. The effect is that every year a cycle occurs where AMSP graduates report into a unit with the previous officers leaving to fill newly vacated slots throughout the operational Army. This same process has been going on since the inception of AMSP over twenty-seven years ago.⁶⁰

The warrant officer, upon graduation from AMSP, reports to the next assignment for at least three years. This means that the warrant officer holds that AMSP slot and causes it not to be available for the entire time. The possibility exists that three years' worth of graduates will not have an opportunity to go to that assignment. The problem becomes more acute when the leadership of that organization does not want the warrant to depart which equates to another year group not having the chance of going there, especially if the assignment is a highly valued job. The warrant officer AMSP graduate complicates the AMSP assignment process. However, the benefit of the continuity provided by a warrant officer AMSP graduate combined with the ongoing shortfall of AMSP graduates for Tier 1 positions renders this argument moot.

⁵⁹U. S. Department of the Army, *School of Advanced Military Studies Program Guide* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2011), 7.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, 5.

Keeping Warrant Officers Relevant Post-AMSP

There is a possibility for a tertiary argument against the warrant officers being long-term AMSP planners. The issue has to do with the consistent updating of the course material taught at AMSP. To keep the course relevant the faculty and leadership of SAMS routinely change the course material. The professors engage with decision makers, former graduates, and conduct unit visits to ensure the lessons taught at AMSP are still applicable. Currently there is no plan in place that brings the warrant officer back to AMSP to ensure he is using the latest tools and lessons-learned in developing plans. The AMSP provides a ready-made solution to this problem. The warrant officer uses the self-development tools taught at AMSP to stay abreast of the changes the course is teaching to the newest crop of students.⁶¹ The tools provided at AMSP enable warrant officer graduates to both continue self-development, and to mentor other officers in this strong military and academic tradition.

“You ain’t the boss of me!” Warrant officers leading OPTs

Commanders may task warrant officers with the AMSP qualification to lead Operational Planning Teams (OPTs). OPT leaders frequently lead teams that contain peers and officers who outrank them. This situation presents a challenge for any officer, and that challenge would be the same for the warrant officer OPT lead. One of the goals of the AMSP is to teach students on the particulars of running an OPT. When a warrant officer is in charge, the possibility exists that O-grade officer – OPT members may resist the warrant officers leadership, and challenge the authority delegated to the warrant.

⁶¹The AMSP staff engages with decision makers and former students from the operational Army to ensure that the course material is relevant.

Warrant officer AMSP students practice interpersonal leadership skills with Majors in the AMSP environment, and continue to develop the skills necessary to lead OPTs through this practice. Additionally the OPT lead is delegated authority from the orders of the Corps or Division Operations Officer and acts on behalf of the commander. The enhanced experience and professionalism provided during the AMSP prepares the warrant officer to manage these situations with professionalism and confidence.

The situation in which a junior officer is responsible for supervising the work of someone senior to him or her in rank occurs frequently. Another anecdote came from a recent SAMS Seminar discussion. A Division Operations Officer was junior in grade to many of the officers on a staff. The Division Commander reminded all those on the staff that the operations officer worked directly for him and directed his staff to adjust to the situation. The Seminar Leader was successful in his work duties in combat, subsequently received a promotion, and is going to be a brigade commander.⁶² John Kotter writes about this concept in his book, *Power and Influence* when he proposes a theory where relationships outside of the chain of command are the most important for any organization.⁶³

Summary

There are several arguments against warrant officers Attending AMSP, however none of these arguments holds up under scrutiny. A graduate education confers a level of expertise that enhances a student's professional knowledge and ability. It also provides a level of expertise to facilitate the teaching of others. Warrant officers who attend AMSP are better able to support commanders at the highest levels of the Army because they combine their

⁶²COL Christopher LaNeve, interviewed by author, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 21 October 2012.

⁶³John Kotter, *Power and Influence*, (New York: The Free Press, 1985), 58.

longer career experience, technical expertise, and longer utilization timeframes with the enhanced critical and creative thinking provided by the AMSP curriculum, to provide a unique combination to support today's Army.

Section 5: Conclusion

Army warrant officers are experts and are the specialists in a particular field. The concentration in a specific field is in contrast to the more generalist career paths of other officers. Nevertheless, throughout the history of the Army warrant officers have found themselves in command of maritime vessels, aircraft, and special units. As the warrant officer progresses to serve in higher levels of command, they mature into systems experts rather than equipment experts. According to Army Design Reference Publication 6-22 (2012), "They must have a firm grasp of the environment and know how to integrate the systems they manage into complex operational environments." Additionally, the Army expects senior and master level warrant officers to provide the commander with the benefit of years of tactical and technical experience to accomplish any mission.

Furthermore, the Warrant Officer cohort is now more educated in both civilian and military educated to meet the demands facing the operational Army. All these attributes plus an undergraduate degree allows the warrant officer to meet the prerequisites to attend AMSP. The Army continues to fall short of the demand for AMSP educated officers but the continued enrollment of warrant officers into AMSP helps the Army to fill the gap. The benefits of capitalizing on the depth of experience gained by many warrant officers outweigh the other concerns.

Several policy and process changes and adaptations are suggested by the above analysis. A small sample of them is highlighted here. The first recommendation is to raise awareness of the AMSP in the warrant officer community. One way to accomplish this is for the AMSP Director to

address the warrant officers attending WOSC and WOSSC at Fort Rucker. The Director or a designated representative would raise awareness of the benefits of AMSP to the warrant officer cohort and the Army. There is currently no formal process for warrant officers to learn about AMSP. These briefings would be similar to briefs the AMSP Director delivers to prospective students at ILE. They emphasize expectations and demands of the course with time set aside for student questions to raise awareness, and ensure quality candidates apply. Another opportunity to increase quality warrant officer applicants is to invite the interested students to Fort Leavenworth to meet current AMSP students. These are all opportunities that expose possible future O-grade students to the course and assist them with making the decision to attend AMSP, and similar opportunities would be helpful to prospective warrant officer AMSP students.

Another way to increase warrant officer applicants to AMSP is to make an incentive for warrant officers to attend AMSP and to serve a successful utilization tour post-graduation. This approach is similar to broadening assignments linked to promotions. In 2008, Army Chief of Staff George Casey acknowledged the importance of service by Army officers on the different types of Military Transition Teams (MTT). The general instructed promotion boards and command boards to consider service on MTT as equivalent to other branch-specific "key developmental" positions (battalion operations or battalion executive officer).⁶⁴ Warrant officer promotion boards can use same method to shape future warrant officer promotions by directing them to consider AMSP as a favorable quality for promotion or retention.

The final recommendation is to create an Additional Skill Identifier (ASI) for warrant officers who complete AMSP. The ASI is a tool used to track personnel who have achieved a skill that the Army needs and has identified positions throughout the force that require that

⁶⁴"Complete for Promotion with Transition Team Experience," Army News Service, last modified July 10, 2008, <http://rotc.military.com/rotc/news-article.jsf?aid=171488&cms=1>, (accessed 13 October 2012).

particular skillset. The Army Red Team Course petitioned the Army to create two new ASI for their various courses to identify those personnel for the potential follow on utilization.

Additionally the ASI for AMSP warrant officers will drive branches to code positions that require AMSP qualified warrant officers. These three recommendations ensure that the Army continues reap the benefits of selecting warrant officers for AMSP.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Authorized Strengths: Commissioned Officers on Active Duty in Grades of Major, Lieutenant Colonel, and Colonel.* U.S. Code 10 (2012), § 523.
- Center for Army Leadership. *About Leadership: ADP 6-22.* <http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/events/ADP622/>, (accessed 7 August 2012).
- “Complete for Promotion with Transition Team Experience.” *Army News Service*, last modified 10 July 2008, <http://rotc.military.com/rotc/news-article.jsf?aid=171488&cms=1>, (accessed 13 October 2012).
- Cutler, Deborah W. and Thomas J. Cutler. *Dictionary of Naval Terms.* Naval Institute Press, 2005.
- Dempsey, Martin. “Win. Learn. Focus. Adapt. Win Again.” *AUSA Compilation of General Dempsey’s Speeches.* http://www.ausa.org/publications/ilw/ilw_pubs/specialreports/Documents/Dempsey_web.pdf, (accessed 15 May 2012).
- Ebel, John E. “FAQ: Applying to Graduate School.” Boston College Website, <http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/offices/careers/pdf/gradschool.pdf> (accessed 1 September 2012).
- Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion: Time in Grade and Other Requirement.* U.S. Code 10 (2004), § 619.
- Emerson, William. *Encyclopedia of United States Army Insignia and Uniforms.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.
- Establishment of Promotion Zones.* U.S. Code 10 (2012), § 623.
- Field Artillery Journal.* “Warranted Officers,” (September 1976): 36.
- Goble, Jeffery J. “Wants and Needs: SAMS’ Relationship with the Army.” Monograph, School of Advanced Military Studies, 2008.
- Institute of Heraldry. “Insignia of Grade - Warrant Officers.” *War Department Circular 366*, November 7, 1942, http://www.tioh.hqda.pentagon.mil/UniformedServices/Insignia_Rank/warrant_officers.aspx, (accessed 1 May 2012).
- Jackson, Ramon. “Army Ships-The Ghost Fleet,” <http://patriot.net/~eastlnd2/army-amps.htm> (accessed 1 May 2012).
- Kotter, John. *Power and Influence.* New York: The Free Press, 1985.
- Lavery, Brian. *Nelson’s Navy: The Ships, Men, and Organization, 1783-1815.* London: Conway Maritime Press, 1989.
- LaNeve, Christopher, COL. Interviewed by author. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. 21 October 2012.
- Martin, Craig. “Warrant Officers Show Why They Belong in SAMS.” *Fort Leavenworth Lamp*, 7 Oct 2010, <http://www.ftleavenworthlamp.com/perspective/commentary/x1868326686/Warrant-officers-show-why-they-belong-in-SAMS> (accessed 1 April 2012).
- Spolizino, Thomas, CPT. E-mail to author. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. 12 October 2012.
- U.S. Army Warrant Officer Career College. *Army WO History*, <http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/wocc/woprogram.asp#history>, (accessed 1 May 2012).

- U.S. Army Warrant Officer Recruiting. *Warrant Officer Prerequisites and Duty Description 311 CID Agent*. Last modified September 10, 2012, <http://www.usarec.army.mil/hq/warrant/prerequ/WO311A.shtml>, (accessed 1 May 2012).
- U.S. Congress. House. *The United States Army Appropriations Act of 1918*. 65th Cong.
- U.S. Congressional Budget Office. *The Warrant Officer Ranks: Adding Flexibility to Military Personnel Management*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2002.
- U.S. Department of the Army. Army Regulation 600-3. *Officer Professional Development and Career Management* (2010), www.apd.army.mil/pdffiles/p600_3.pdf.
- _____. Army Regulation 600-8. *Processing Personnel for Separation* (2010), http://www.apd.army.mil/pdffiles/r635_10.pdf.
- _____. Army Regulation 601-210. *Active and Reserve Components Enlistment Program*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 2011.
- _____. Army Regulation 611-11. *Selection and Training of Army Aviation Officers*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1997.
- _____. MILPER Message 99-060. *Applying for Officer Candidate School (OCS)* (1999), <https://www.hrc.army.mil/milper/99-060>.
- _____. *School of Advanced Military Studies Program Guide*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2011.
- _____. *School of Advanced Military Studies Program Tier One Distribution Policy*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2010.
- _____. “The Army Training and Leader Development Panel ATLDP Phase III – Warrant Officer Study Final Report, 2002.” Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2002.
- _____. “Warrant Officers,” <http://www.goarmy.com/about/service-options/enlisted-soldiers-and-officers/warrant-officers.html> (accessed 1 May 2012).
- Warrant Officer; Grades*. U.S. Code 10 (2012), § 571.
- Warrant Officers Heritage Foundation, et.al. “Army Warrant Officer History,” *The Legacy of Leadership as a Warrant Officer*, http://www.usawoa.org/woheritage/hist_of_army_wo.htm, (accessed 1 May 2012).